

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GREGORY BRIAN WILLIS,

Case No. 09-13406

Plaintiff,

Avern Cohn

vs.

United States District Judge

UNKNOWN DETROIT POLICE OFFICERS,

Michael Hluchaniuk

Defendants.

United States Magistrate Judge

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE (Dkt. 9)**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. 9). Plaintiff, an inmate currently at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility, brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, claiming a violations of his rights under the United States Constitution. (Dkt. 1). Plaintiff is suing unnamed police officers from the City of Detroit and Sergeant Jim Graham, alleging that he was wrongfully prosecuted, that defendants lacked probable cause for the prosecution, and that the prosecution was undertaken with recklessness and malice. *Id.* On September 9, 2009, this case was referred to the undersigned for all pretrial purposes by District Judge Avern Cohn. (Dkt. 4).

In support of his request for counsel, plaintiff states that because he is not an

attorney, he is unable to properly present his claims in an orderly manner, that he is unable to afford counsel, and that his imprisonment may limit his access to the law library, which would limit his ability to litigate this case. (Dkt. 9).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), a federal court may request an attorney to represent an indigent plaintiff. *Reneer v. Sewell*, 975 F.2d 261 (6th Cir. 1992). Except in rare circumstances, it is the practice of this Court to consider the appointment of counsel in prisoner civil rights cases only where exceptional circumstances exist, or in certain cases only after a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment has been decided. In order to make the determination whether there are exceptional circumstances to appoint counsel, the Court considers the type of case involved, plaintiff's ability to represent himself, as well as the complexity of the case, and also whether the claims being presented are frivolous or have a small likelihood of success. *Reneer*, 975 F.2d at 261; *see also Mars v. Hanberry*, 752 F.2d 254, 256 (6th Cir. 1995).

It appears that, from reading the complaint, plaintiff has an adequate understanding of the issues and matters involved in this case, and is able to articulate the claims and arguments in a reasonable fashion. It also appears that the issues raised in his complaint are straightforward and understandable and not of an unduly complex nature. Further, should dispositive motion(s) be decided in

plaintiff's favor, plaintiff may re-file the motion for the appointment of counsel.

Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The parties to this action may object to and seek review of this Order, but are required to file any objections within 10 days of service as provided for in 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.1(d)(2). A party may not assign as error any defect in this Order to which timely objection was not made. Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(a). Any objections are required to specify the part of the Order to which the party objects and state the basis of the objection. Pursuant to Local Rule 72.1(d)(2), objections must be served on this Magistrate Judge.

Date: October 28, 2009

s/Michael Hluchaniuk
Michael Hluchaniuk
United States Magistrate Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on October 28, 2009, I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following: not applicable, and I certify that I have mailed by United States Postal Service the paper to the following non-ECF participant(s): Gregory Brian Willis, # 207545, GUS HARRISON CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, 2727 E. Beecher Street, Adrian, MI 49221.

s/James P. Peltier
Courtroom Deputy Clerk
U.S. District Court
600 Church Street
Flint, MI 48502
(810) 341-7850
pete_peltier@mied.uscourts.gov